GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSIONER

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY - SPECIAL

APPLICATION FOR A CAMPUS : Case No.

PLAN : 06-11 : 06-12

and

:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON:
UNIVERSITY - FIRST STAGE:
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT:
AND RELATED ZONING MAP:
AMENDMENT:

----:

Thursday, November 30, 2006

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 06-11 and 06-12 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice-Chairperson
GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner
JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS) MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

DONNA HANOUSEK Zoning Specialist General Counsel ESTHER BUSHMAN

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER TRAVIS PARKER

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on November 30, 2006.

I-N-D-E-X

WITNESS	EXAMINATION
BILL CREWS	
Cross by Ms. Kahlow	7
JEFF JENNINGS	
Cross by Mr. Hitchcock	71
Cross by Ms. Kahlow	83
LOUIS KATZ	
Direct by Mr. Hitchcock	93
CHARLES BARBER	
Direct by Mr. Hitchcock	95
Direct by Ms. Kahlow	99
Closing Statements	
By Ms. Dwyer	102
By Mr. Katz	105
Adjournment	

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

and gentlemen.

the

name

joining me this evening are

Parsons.

Commissioner Jeffries shortly.

The

And

of

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

Zoning

District of Columbia for Thursday, November

Anthony Hood and Commissioners Mike Turnbull

subject of

hearing is Zoning Commission Case Nos. 06-11

October 11th, 2006 hearing, this request by GW

for special exception relief and approval of

the Foggy Bottom Campus Plan proposed for 2006

abbreviated agenda tonight, I'm not going to

since

And we

This

Commission

is Carol Mitten.

are

this

And it is a continuation of our

2

1

(5:08 p.m.)

Good evening,

is a public

of

Vice Chairman

expecting

evening's

the

3

4

ladies

hearing

30th, 2006.

and John

and 06-12.

through 2025.

_

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

read the entire opening statement. But I just

we

have

а

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

pretty

remind folks want to that we being recorded by the court reporter being and webcast live. And so we ask you to refrain from making any disruptive noises and that includes beepers and cell phones. So if you would turn those off right now that would be very helpful.

So I think everybody who is with us tonight has been sworn in, I think, who is going to testify. Who do we have here from DDOT? Oh, we have Mr. Jennings. Were you sworn in in this case before? Okay.

So this is what I think we are doing. And so if anybody has a different understanding of what we are going, then let me know. But I think what we are going to start with is Ms. Kahlow is going to cross examine Mr. Crews. We will do that first.

And then we will have further cross examination of DDOT to the extent anyone wants to ask any questions. And then I think what we had talked about was having the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	rebuttal testimony. And then any final cross
2	examination on the additional submissions and
3	the rebuttal. Is that your recollection? Is
4	that
5	MS. DWYER: We've done our
6	rebuttal. So unless something comes up
7	tonight
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, did you
9	do that already?
LO	MS. DWYER: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's great.
L2	MS. DWYER: So unless something
L3	comes up tonight
L4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, good.
L5	MS. DWYER: it would just be
L6	any cross. Then our submissions. And then
L7	our closing statement.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Good.
L9	MS. DWYER: One other thing, Jami
20	Milanovich has not been sworn in. So
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
22	MS. DWYER: she should be sworn

1	in just in case she gets asked a question on
2	traffic.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So,
4	Ms. Milanovich if you would just rise and
5	direct your attention to Ms. Schellin, she
6	needs to be sworn in.
7	(Whereupon, potential witness was
8	duly sworn.)
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Great. Okay.
10	So Mr. Crews is here. And Ms. Kahlow, you
11	are up.
12	CROSS EXAMINATION
13	MS. KAHLOW: I am Barbara Kahlow.
14	I'm representing the West End citizen's
15	Association today. Thank you for returning,
16	Mr. Crews.
17	I have three series of questions.
18	One is only two questions. And that is on
19	the audit. Then I have a series of questions
20	about current conditions. And a series of
21	questions about the markup of proposed
22	conditions, your markup of our proposed

1	conditions.
2	Let me start with the simple one,
3	the audit.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now just to
5	remind you, and I know you are mindful of this
6	so perhaps your questions are right in line.
7	But depending on the nature of your question,
8	you know, this is really not about exploring
9	how the audit was done and so on and so forth.
10	MS. KAHLOW: I'm not going to ask
11	anything about it.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Great. Okay.
13	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you. That's
14	FBAs and ANCs.
15	I want to just understand for
16	myself the timing. Why did you wait until the
17	afternoon of September 14th, the first day of
18	the hearing, to give us the August 9th-dated
19	independent audit account report.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That's
21	not relevant. That part is not relevant.
22	MS. KAHLOW: I was just trying to

1 understand because I'm going to be talking 2 about other things we get in. But okay. That's fine. 3 right. And I want to also 4 All in 5 understand terms of process other one 6 question which was page two of your 7 report says that understanding between Office of Zoning, Office of Planning, and GW was that 8 the audit would only involve the student 9 10 headcount. When was this understanding reached? And with whom in OP? 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 12 That's not relevant either. 13 Now we will Okay. 14 MS. KAHLOW: 15 get the actual things that to are 16 important. Let's first 17 go to the current conditions. If you'd look at the April 26, 18 19 `04 order, that's the one that is the most Let's start with number seven. 20 recent one. I'm going to go in order instead of importance 21 in order of the actual conditions.

1	Number seven is streetscape.
2	MR. CREWS: Could you wait just a
3	moment until I grab that?
4	MS. KAHLOW: Sure. Sure.
5	THE WITNESS: You are basically
6	talking about the appendix on number I on
7	BZA I the
8	MS. KAHLOW: Yes.
9	MR. CREWS: Yes? Okay.
10	MS. KAHLOW: It starts with number
11	one and goes to number 20 if that helps. The
12	pages are numbered five through 11.
13	MR. CREWS: And I'm afraid I do
14	not have that with me.
15	MS. KAHLOW: Oh.
16	MR. CREWS: Well, let me just
17	double check. No no, I'm afraid I don't.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Can
19	you hand up what you are working off of and
20	we'll make copies for him.
21	MS. KAHLOW: To whom would you
22	like me to hand them off?

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Schellin.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Excuse me. Shall we
3	await those copies, Ms. Mitten?
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you can go
5	on without that in another area.
6	MS. KAHLOW: I can try to go in
7	the beginning. Number seven is streetscape.
8	The current condition relates to the ten-year
9	campus plan from 2000 to 2009. And we are in
10	year six of the ten years.
11	And I wanted to know before this
12	further processing equivalent application and
13	the others that were submitted for the whole
14	campus, what was GW's shares of the cost
15	expended to date and what was DC's shares of
16	the cost expended to date? How much has been
17	completed?
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Say how that
19	
10	is relevant to this proceeding?
20	is relevant to this proceeding? MS. KAHLOW: Because we are going

1	specific contribution
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
3	MS. KAHLOW: for each of the
4	elements. And we don't have it in the current
5	see that is why I separated it.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So you want
7	to see what the baseline is?
8	MS. KAHLOW: Exactly.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
10	MS. KAHLOW: I want to know and I
11	want to understand because we were rejected
12	from our comment was please have a
13	timetable and specific dollars associated
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.
15	MS. KAHLOW: with each
16	milestone. Since we didn't have it currently
17	and I want to see how they are currently
18	enforcing it. If they don't have the
19	information, then it should be reasons for us
20	to put it in.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
22	Mr. Crews, do you have that

information?

MR. CREWS: I do not. And I believe that since that is a part of the compliance report that perhaps we should work closer with the Office of Zoning to make sure that we obtain a compliance report.

I have an August 28th, 2006 letter from Mr. Barber on the biannual reports required by the Foggy Bottom Campus Plan. But it just addresses, I believe, conditions 9C and 17.

MS. KAHLOW: And I'm not asking about those conditions.

MR. CREWS: Yes, right. Right. Yes. But I think your point is well taken in terms of us working -- myself working closer with the Compliance Officer with the Office of Zoning to discuss, you know, the ability to have an articulation from the University of the compliance with all of the conditions, especially as we, you know, look perspective here that the Commission consider that as a

1	requirement.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. But
3	that's all worthwhile. But to the specific
4	question which is you don't have any
5	documentation regarding the progress of the
6	streetscape plan from the university?
7	MS. KAHLOW: From years one
8	through six of the ten-year period.
9	MR. CREWS: Right. I do not.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
11	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. And now that
12	we are into a new proposal, which overlaps the
13	period, instead of 2000 to 2009, it is 2006
14	through 2025, what percentage of the new
15	streetscape plan overlaps with the remaining,
16	not yet implemented specifics of the current
17	plan?
18	MR. CREWS: That I'm afraid I do
19	not know either.
20	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. Let's go on to
21	number eight. Do you have a copy now of this

document?

1	MR. CREWS: Yes.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Wonderful. Thank
3	you. So we are on page six which is called
4	faculty staff counts. I know the audit didn't
5	deal with it and I just wondered if you have
6	done any research to opine if GW is currently
7	in compliance with the faculty and staff
8	separate counts.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. The
10	current compliance
11	MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, could I
12	just say something for the record?
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
14	MS. DWYER: I thought that this
15	was not going to be a compliance hearing where
16	we go back
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's right.
18	MS. DWYER: and review that.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
20	MS. DWYER: And that the questions
21	were to Mr. Crews's memorandum on the proposed
22	conditions going forward. So I don't know how

1	any of this is relevant.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Because, again, we
3	asked for something in the proposed conditions
4	that he rejected.
5	MS. DWYER: So why not address the
6	proposed conditions and ask why he rejected it
7	without going back
8	MS. KAHLOW: Well, I'm going to.
9	MS. DWYER: through
10	MS. KAHLOW: I was trying to first
11	I was trying to be logical and non-
12	duplicative. That was my way of approaching
13	this. And if he can say no, then we will get
14	to why can't we please. I mean I think this
15	was easier since they are not in the same
16	order.
17	MS. DWYER: Well, my objection
18	still stands because I think we are wasting
19	time. Some of these issues were already
20	addressed in the hearing as to the fact that
21	there wasn't a streetscape plan that was even
22	approved by DDOT. And I think that in the

interest of time, I would suggest that Ms. Kahlow go forward and not go back.

MS. KAHLOW: Now with respect to the faculty staff -- the caps, the WECA recommended that they be separate. And the primary reason for doing so was because of any contracted-out staff.

So the question is do you have any baseline on faculty and staff counts separately so if any of the staff functions are contracted out, you will be able to subtract them from the base?

Do you have any compliance information in the first six years of the campus plan that is currently in effect on staff headcounts and faculty headcounts? I'm trying to explain the context to do what she wants us to do. I think it will be easier for everybody.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We are going to finish tonight, okay? Just everybody know, we are going to finish.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. KAHLOW: And I'm trying to
2	expedite it. I was trying to make it non-
3	duplicative so it will be the end of cross.
4	MR. CREWS: Again, I apologize
5	because apparently I did not grab what I
6	should have grabbed in terms of having the
7	letter that the university sent during the
8	audit that indicated why it was impractical
9	and undesirable at this time to do an audit of
10	the faculty and staff.
11	But I believe that they did have
12	numbers in that letter. And I don't know if
13	the university has a copy of that letter with
14	them now or not. But I think we do have
15	information again, obviously unaudited but
16	some sort of baseline information. And we
17	could be able to provide that to you
18	afterwards.
19	MS. KAHLOW: For year each of
20	the years?
21	MR. CREWS: For the I think it
22	is probably I can only at this point say it

1	would be current or within the last school
2	year.
3	MS. KAHLOW: My understanding from
4	GW officials not in the room and who would
5	like some anonymity is that they are already
6	over the faculty cap so that the progression
7	is very important.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. This
9	is not a conversation.
10	MS. KAHLOW: No. But I'm trying -
11	-
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
13	MS. KAHLOW: to get the
14	progression. I would like it each year so
15	that we can see the progression of staff and
16	the progression of faculty.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The purpose
18	of this exercise is to find out how Mr. Crews
19	would enforce the conditions that have been
20	proffered or would amend the conditions that
21	have been proffered to make them easier to
22	enforce.

1	So rather than trying to delve
2	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:
4	information that he may or may not have that
5	relates to past compliance or even past issues
6	that are not maybe dealt with directly through
7	compliance, could you focus your
8	MS. KAHLOW: All right.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: inquiries
10	on
11	MS. KAHLOW: I'll try to do that.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: the
13	proposal? Thank you.
14	MS. KAHLOW: How will you consider
15	the number of contracted employees providing
16	services within the campus planned boundaries?
17	MR. CREWS: And this is in regard
18	to
19	MS. KAHLOW: The new your new
20	letter number 11.
21	MR. CREWS: the new condition
22	11?

1	MS. KAHLOW: Yes.
2	MR. CREWS: Right.
3	MS. KAHLOW: I know we are moving
4	around but they didn't want us to go in order.
5	And that is what the new one is called, New
6	Eleven.
7	MR. CREWS: Again, from looking
8	at what we've said is that I had recommended
9	because of the difference in terms of
10	determining faculty and staff to consider
11	having them as a whole because it, again, it
12	seems to me that the point is the impact of
13	people in the neighborhood. And that it would
14	be, you know, so the total number was good.
15	I think that the part, if I'm
16	looking correctly at the that your
17	suggestion addition was in red here, the
18	annual report shall indicate each company with
19	a contract to provide services
20	MS. KAHLOW: It is in 6E and 11.
21	We asked in 6E for the headcount of staff and
22	faculty separately. And then in 11 we asked

for it and we asked for the contracted employees within the campus.

And what I wanted -- what I asked you is what we want to understand. How will you consider the number of contract employees since they obviously have an impact on our community when those contracts are outsourced?

MR. CREWS: Okay, again, it would be up to the Commission to determine whether or not contract employees were part of the count. And it seems to me that then if it is not further defined, that we would just have to ask the university.

And I would also hope that, you know, that if the Commission so desires, that we would be able to audit that information, that they would provide the contracts.

The auditor or the audit, again, just in -- nothing set in stone now but would have to come up with a way of figuring out is this all the contracts and the contract employees that campus it are on so that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

involves the Commission's articulation in the conditions of what is included and then we would work with the university and with the neighbors and the ANC, as I have mentioned before, in terms of designing future audits as we, you know, under continuous improvement mantra, to figure out the way to make sure that we had all of the contract employees.

MS. KAHLOW: So my question gets to -- since you don't -- you haven't really figured out what to do -- do you think that the staff cap or combined cap, if you are going to do a combined cap, should be adjusted downward if some functions are contracted out so that there will continue to be the same number of impacted employees in the Foggy Bottom area?

MR. CREWS: Well, again, I think that is a policy question for the Commission.

But it certainly seems that if the goal is to address the impacts that the university has on the residential neighborhood that the folks

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that are there because of the university in
2	whatever capacity should be considered.
3	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I need to step
4	back on the streetscape. I don't think you
5	answered the question. And maybe I didn't
6	pose it clear enough. Why did you reject the
7	WECA's addition of a timetable for
8	implementation of each streetscape element and
9	the specification of dollars to be paid by GW
10	for each element?
11	MR. CREWS: And what number is
12	that now?
13	MS. KAHLOW: Twenty-one.
14	MR. CREWS: Twenty-one.
15	MS. KAHLOW: I meant to say that
16	when we were having that original discussion
17	and then Ms. Dwyer asked me to combine it. So
18	I meant do that. I'm sorry. Thank you.
19	MR. CREWS: I thought that I said
20	that WECA's suggestion of inclusion of a
21	timetable is appropriate for condition 6F.
22	Implementation can be evaluated by the

1	Commission then at further proceedings on how
2	they are what their comparison of actuality
3	is with the timetable.
4	And, again, then that would be up
5	to the Commission, I think, to then be able to
6	determine if they are in compliance.
7	MS. KAHLOW: Well at the bottom,
8	you don't have it in the text of yours. You
9	didn't take our textual change. In the
10	bottom, you say the WECA's suggestion of an
11	inclusion of a timetable is appropriate. And
12	then you say you do it on a case-by-case
13	basis.
14	I'm saying since this is the
15	campus plan and we had no progress
16	MR. CREWS: Where was the case-by-
17	case basis?
18	MS. KAHLOW: Can be evaluated by
19	the Commission each further processing in each
20	application. That is your sentence.
21	MR. CREWS: Yes, right. Well
22	what I mean by that is each time they would

sort of modification in for some depending on if there is additional Zoning Commission approval required for certain actions in the campus plan that each time it came before the Commission, it seemed like that would be something that could be judged by the Commission in terms of whether or not they are in compliance with that timetable and whatever remarks they might have in terms of why they are or aren't.

And then the Commission has the ability to determine if that is satisfactory or not. And so my goal --

MS. KAHLOW: Well, Mr. Crews --

MR. CREWS: -- was to give neighborhood another benchmark in terms compliance with the conditions by suggesting that it would be appropriate at each step along the way, depending on where you were on timetable, the where they were in implementation.

MS. KAHLOW: Well, the timetable

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	is not in the condition as you rewrote it.
2	You didn't accept our language. And I'm
3	asking why you didn't accept it. It is not in
4	the test the non-italics text. And, in
5	fact, the further processing applications are
6	only for specific sites. And the streetscape
7	is for the entire campus plan area.
8	So it doesn't make any sense to
9	just do it for the further processing
10	applications. And that is why we asked for a
11	timetable with each. And the question is
12	MR. CREWS: Okay. Now let me
13	MS. KAHLOW: where is it?
14	Maybe it is
15	MR. CREWS: direct you
16	MS. KAHLOW: somewhere else.
17	MR. CREWS: let me direct you
18	to 6F.
19	MS. KAHLOW: Yes. New 6F?
20	MR. CREWS: New 6F where
21	MS. KAHLOW: I see that there is a
22	timetable there. That was a change. But you

1	don't have the amount of money and what the
2	plan is. I mean we need to have fuller detail
3	to see if we are getting something. It is
4	especially important because whoever's failure
5	aside, we got nothing in the first six years
6	in the current campus plan.
7	If you could just review that, I
8	think
9	MR. CREWS: Okay.
10	MS. KAHLOW: that would be the
11	easiest way to do that.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I guess what
13	I'm hearing is that Mr. Crews is not rejecting
14	your suggestion.
15	MS. KAHLOW: I understand.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He might not
17	be embracing your suggestion with the same
18	degree of enthusiasm that you are making it.
19	But I think what he is saying is that has
20	merit.
21	And the one missing piece, I
22	think, is that in the conversation may be that

you are looking for enforcement. If there is 1 2 a benchmark date that is missed --MS. KAHLOW: Right. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: you are looking for an enforcement when it is missed. 5 MS. KAHLOW: Exactly. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Crews is saying well that would be -- the enforcement 8 would come upon further processing. 9 10 becomes a function, to me, of the manner in which enforcement will be achieved in the 11 existing campus plan, the biggest benchmark 12 13 which has to do with putting beds on campus when they would get -- the real enforcement 14 15 would come that you wouldn't get a further 16 processing because of the lack of compliance. So I think that is why Mr. Crews 17 is taking the position that he is taking. 18 19 unless I've missed something, that is what I got out of that exchange. 20 That's fine. MS. KAHLOW: 21

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

MS. KAHLOW: -- what is difficult is we want to get on the record that some of these things we suggested are valuable and we would like them in the final. And the only way I can do it is if he can't do it in the current because the current condition is not specific enough and he hasn't put it in the next version, I'm asking us to all look at it again.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

So, Mr. Crews, you are not rejecting their suggestion?

MR. CREWS: Oh, not at all. And matter of fact, it may have been an oversight then in terms of what -- and, again, apologize because I don't have the -- your proposed draft to see what that language was order but the in of checking its enforceability but I would be willing to take another look at that and, you know, in terms of, you know, perhaps in addition, you know, if it doesn't present enforceability problems

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	to indicate that.
2	What I am understanding what you
3	are looking for is not only the timetable for
4	the implementation but also the funding that
5	goes along with the
6	MS. KAHLOW: Absolutely.
7	MR. CREWS: And I think that if
8	that was established
9	MS. KAHLOW: Let me read you the
10	language.
11	MR. CREWS: ahead of time, and
12	the Commission included it, that it obviously
13	would be enforceable, I mean in terms of, you
14	know, having those numbers. And, you know,
15	keyed to the time frame.
16	And then the university, I would
17	assume, would be able to provide both the
18	articulation of what has actually been
19	accomplished on the time frame and how much
20	money was used to do it.
21	MS. KAHLOW: Just for the record,
22	let me read you 21 and our suggested changes

you didn't take.

"The university shall prepare a detailed streetscape plan applicable to the entire Foggy Bottom campus." We said, "including a timetable for implementation of each element and specification of the dollars prepaid by the university."

And then we also list some other areas, sidewalk and pathway materials, et cetera. And that is important to us because of the brick business that we think brick is dangerous. And that is why we asked.

So we -- all of our language was not accepted. And I think if you could look at that again.

MR. CREWS: Yes. And actually just from reading that I think that the Commission, you know, it would be enforceable either way. That definitely that -- and again it is a policy decision but obviously it could very well be that I was assuming that the timetable included not only the activities but

1	the funding to go along with it.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Well the current
3	campus plan has neither a timetable or
4	funding. And that is why you are stuck not
5	having an answer. So we want to be sure we
6	don't have that problem in the future.
7	All right. Let's go to another
8	area. And I will try to do the old and the
9	new. Student vehicles old
10	MR. CREWS: Number?
11	MS. KAHLOW: 15E.
12	MR. CREWS: Oh, okay. Yes?
13	MS. KAHLOW: I think we are trying
14	to do old and then new.
15	MR. CREWS: Okay. Oh, I'm sorry.
16	Yes?
17	MS. KAHLOW: I think that is the
18	easiest to crosswalk before 15E I'm
19	hoping you all have a copy okay? It is
20	called Student Vehicles. And we made a
21	variety of suggestions. But let me first ask
22	how did you or will you monitor GW's traffic

1	management plan covering parking and traffic?
2	MR. CREWS: Again, I'm looking at
3	the new 22D, Student Vehicles. Is that
4	MS. KAHLOW: Yes, I'm going to get
5	to the new.
6	MR. CREWS: Okay.
7	MS. KAHLOW: I want to first get
8	to the old and then the new. I want to
9	understand since there is not enough
10	specificity, the old, how did you find also
11	not enough specificity?
12	Was there enough specificity that
13	you could monitor it? Do you have any data on
14	current student vehicles? How did GW "direct"
15	students to go register their vehicles in DC
16	or obtain a reciprocity sticker? Things like
17	that. That is in the current. Do you have
18	data on that?
19	MR. CREWS: No.
20	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. Did you
21	examine if there are any written directives
22	for perspective for parents or perspective

1	students?
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Can we
3	let's focus on the new one.
4	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And to the
6	extent it incorporates language that is in the
7	old one
8	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: then he
10	has some direct experience with it. But let's
11	focus on
12	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: the new
14	one.
15	MS. KAHLOW: All right. Okay.
16	So let's go to the new one which
17	is 22D under the new one. Does that help?
18	This is your Student Vehicle one.
19	WECA proposed an enormously
20	different Student Vehicle one. And I'm going
21	to ask you about why you rejected
22	MR. CREWS: Do you have a copy

1	an extra copy of what you have provided?
2	MS. KAHLOW: I don't. I don't.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We are
4	actually
5	MR. CREWS: Could maybe Sharon
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: making one
7	for you right now.
8	MR. CREWS: could maybe make
9	one for me?
10	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you.
11	MR. CREWS: Yes.
12	MS. KAHLOW: I only
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, Donna is
14	making one right now.
15	MR. CREWS: Oh, okay. Okay. I'm
16	sorry.
17	MS. KAHLOW: But I'll try to go
18	one by one. Since student vehicles are parked
19	throughout our community, we want to know why
20	you rejected and one by one A, notice of
21	the restriction, at least one written document
22	mailed to parents and perspective students.

1	Why did you reject that?
2	At this point, this is the
3	restriction on freshmen and sophomores. And
4	they use the term discouragement for other
5	classes. But the question is why didn't you
6	want that in a written document going to
7	parents and perspective students?
8	MR. CREWS: Again, the more
9	specificity the conditions have, the easier it
10	is to enforce.
11	MS. KAHLOW: Exactly.
12	MR. CREWS: So if that would be
13	that would be a more specific requirement. So
14	that would be, you know, easily enforceable.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The question,
16	though, West End Citizens Association wanted
17	notice they wanted evidence of notice going
18	to parents. So how would you enforce that
19	MR. CREWS: That, the evidence
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: globally?
21	MR. CREWS: of notice going to
22	the parents

1	MS. KAHLOW: Written notice.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Written
3	notice.
4	MR. CREWS: Yes, well first of all
5	we would have a copy of the written notice.
6	And we would have an affidavit stating on how
7	the university distributed that to the parents
8	and what kind of lists they used to distribute
9	it.
10	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. Wonderful. So
11	you had rejected it but you are reconsidering
12	it.
13	The second one
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, he's just
15	I do want to make something clear
16	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: is that
18	Mr. Crews was consulted not so that he could
19	make value judgments about what's good he
20	understands the difference between the policy
21	questions, if you will, that the Zoning
22	Commission will put in place and his

implementation of the condition.

And he is responding to, you know, whether things would be enforceable or not enforceable. Or how they would be enforceable. So it is not a question of him accepting or rejecting as if that is a value judgment on the condition. I just want to clarify that.

MS. KAHLOW: Okay. And I just wanted us to have the opportunity to explore some of the proposals we made that we think have great value. And the first was to get a notice of a restriction in at least one written document.

The second was -- I'm looking at American University's parking policy and it has freshmen's and sophomores' signatures on the awareness of the parking restrictions. Why did you reject that?

I could read you what American University has. Let me read you that sentence. All students must provide a

NEAL R. GROSS

1	signature to indicate they have read and
2	understand its terms regardless of whether
3	they drive to school or are eligible to have a
4	car on campus. Signing the policy is a
5	condition of student registration and
6	signifies the student's acceptance of the
7	terms and conditions during his or her entire
8	time at the university.
9	What I did was I went through
10	every university and I'm just giving an
11	example of one. And the question is why did

you not include that or mention it or anything else?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How do you

MR. CREWS: I would enforce that very similar in terms of -- again, it could be audited and when I say audited, you know, I hope we are talking about, you know, a statistical audit so we, you know, wouldn't look at every signature. But --

MS. KAHLOW: We'd be happy to have

NEAL R. GROSS

enforce that?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

-		
		_

MR. CREWS: -- if that was included, that would be the process of doing that, right.

MS. KAHLOW: Perfect.

The third one that doesn't seem to be mentioned in yours is sanctions for violators. And I can read you each of the universities' sanctions if you would like to hear them or at least you'll know that everybody has got it.

Sanctions for people that violate, why do we not have that?

MR. CREWS: Again, why don't you read me what your --

MS. KAHLOW: We had suggested in page Y8 -- oh, I guess you don't have it yet.

The university shall appropriately sanction any discovered violators and keep a full accounting of all violations and sanctions.

MR. CREWS: Okay. Well the ability to, again, audit the sanctions, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	number of sanctions would be available or
2	doable, I guess. And then the question that -
3	- the one word you had there that
4	appropriately, I think is that the
5	MS. KAHLOW: Shall appropriately
6	sanction. We wanted to give that flexibility
7	to the university. The other places just say
8	it is going to be sanctioned but we didn't
9	really go that far.
10	MR. CREWS: Okay.
11	MS. KAHLOW: We're happy to have
12	any language you are happy with.
13	Let me read you what AU has just
14	to give an example. In addition to fines
15	listed below, failure to comply with this
16	regulation is a violation of Section 17 of the
17	Housing Agreement. And then it goes on and on
18	from there.
19	Theirs is very specific, their
20	parking policy. And the question is could we
21	be more specific so it is enforceable?

MR.

CREWS: Other than using the

1	term appropriately without further definition,
2	and I would assume or would proffer, I guess,
3	that appropriately might be in a written
4	guidance document that the university could
5	provide in terms of what are appropriate
6	sanctions that that would be enforceable,
7	again, the way you have it.
8	I'm just if I can read ahead
9	here now that I have a copy of it
10	MS. KAHLOW: It's that whole
11	section.
12	MR. CREWS: Right.
13	MS. KAHLOW: I'm only mentioning -
14	- I'm going to mention one more actually
15	the whole section we would like since we
16	proposed the whole section. But I wanted to
17	understand at least four of the rejections.
18	MR. CREWS: I think the so the
19	next one would be the notifying of all
20	undergrad and graduate students that parking
21	is prohibited on the streets?

MS. KAHLOW: Well, I was using the

GW Mount Vernon campus and it says parking is prohibited on the streets adjacent to and surrounding the Mount Vernon campus. And Georgetown says it is also not possible to park on the streets outside the main gates.

So the question is why would we not have a prohibition on parking? Not the freshmen and sophomores who can't bring the cars but everyone else? A prohibition of parking on the streets adjacent to and surrounding the Foggy Bottom campus, that was our proposal.

MR. CREWS: Okay, that part I'm not sure exactly how we would enforce that or who would be responsible for enforcing that in terms of is that something the Department of Public Works Parking Enforcement section does? And I apologize, I'm not familiar if there are residential restriction zones in the neighborhood.

MS. KAHLOW: Since you are in charge of the compliance for the Mount Vernon

NEAL R. GROSS

1	campus and for Georgetown and they both have
2	it, perhaps your office knows how that is
3	enforced.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, let me
5	just clarify. It is not that the parking
6	prohibition is enforced. The condition that
7	you are proffering is that the university
8	shall notify. And that is if and fact the
9	prohibition exists. But
LO	MS. KAHLOW: Well, there are four
11	different things.
L2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: the
L3	enforceability for the Zoning Administrator is
L4	the notification, not anything that flows from
15	it.
L6	MS. KAHLOW: First was the
L7	notification to the parents and perspective
L8	students. Then
L9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, I'm in
20	MS. KAHLOW: there is this
21	awareness. Then there is the sanction for
22	violators. And then there is the prohibition.

1	And the prohibition would be something he'd
2	get in a written document. He'd see that
3	there is a prohibition on parking on the
4	streets adjacent to and surrounding the Foggy
5	Bottom campus as I was able to find on
6	everybody's website.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. But
8	what I'm saying, just for clarity, is that it
9	is not it would not if that were an
10	accepted condition, it would not be the role
11	of the Zoning Administrator to actually go out
12	and put tickets on cars.
13	MS. KAHLOW: Oh, no, no. That's
14	right.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
16	MR. CREWS: Yes, okay.
17	MS. KAHLOW: He'd be going to the
18	website, as I did, to see that it is a written
19	policy for each of these universities.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Exactly.
21	MR. CREWS: Right. And similar to
22	if they would add the notification to the

parents, that they would show the notification and articulate in an affidavit on how they distributed that. And then again, because it is -- the university shall notify, you know, how they notify, how often, you know the different types of languages that might be required, you know, none of that is articulated here.

So it would have to be just at this level that they would articulate how they notified it. And then it becomes a compliance issue that I think is best for the Zoning Commission. If the Zoning Commission decides they are out of compliance, then we could work in terms of how we would enforce the lack of compliance.

MS. KAHLOW: Okay.

If you look at the language you accepted versus rejected, it has some of the repeat language from the last time that says the university shall direct students to register the vehicles in DC or obtain a

NEAL R. GROSS

1	reciprocity sticker.
2	Now so what happens is they are
3	giving you documents that show they are doing
4	that? That is how you expect that?
5	MR. CREWS: Right. That would be
6	similar to your proposal for notification.
7	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. All right. I
8	think we've beat that dead horse. But we all
9	know how important this is to our community.
10	MR. CREWS: Yes, exactly.
11	MS. KAHLOW: All right. Now I'm
12	moving and, as you know, the zoning
13	regulations require no objectionable noise,
14	traffic, or other
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Just
16	let's
17	MS. KAHLOW: so this is why
18	this is so important.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: eliminate
20	the editorializing and just move
21	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: to the

1	questions.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Traffic management
3	plan, the next one, 23.
4	MR. CREWS: Yes?
5	MS. KAHLOW: New 23 let me see
6	the old number for it. Just give me a second
7	since they are out of order. I guess it is
8	new 23. New 23B says measures to discourage
9	travel by private automobile and encourage
10	travel by public transportation.
11	And we, of course, were unhappy
12	with the discourage language. We wanted the
13	restrict language carried forward in the
14	traffic management plan. Now you rejected it.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So what is
16	the question for Mr. Crews?
17	MS. KAHLOW: Why did you reject
18	the WECA's restrict language? I'm trying to
19	go before the old and new.
20	MR. CREWS: Well, again, the
21	measures to restrict seem to put the
22	university in the position of parking

enforcement. And I'm not sure exactly how that would occur. In terms of checkpoints or at what level the university's commitment would have to be to restrict. I mean do they have to physically stop them from coming?

MS. KAHLOW: Well, what we did is we explained it in 22D and then in 23B, which is transportation, we suggested and you didn't accept measures to restrict freshmen and sophomores from bringing cars to Foggy Bottom West End Area and to discourage travel by private automobiles, by upperclassmen, graduate students, and university faculty and staff.

So we separated the restriction from the discouragement and you rejected that.

MR. CREWS: Again -- well, again, I think, you know, it's -- again, it is a policy question but the discouragement doesn't involve nearly the -- and this is, I think, probably your point as a matter of fact. But then what will you mean by restrict. What

NEAL R. GROSS

1	exactly are they supposed to do to restrict?
2	I think the discourage is, you
3	know it very well may be an easier burden to
4	meet. And that may be your certainly your
5	policy concern, I understand, but what exactly
6	would we do to restrict the
7	MS. KAHLOW: In 22D, you have
8	excepted, in particular, freshmen and
9	sophomores who are not exempted from the Foggy
10	Bottom campus housing requirement are
11	prohibited from bringing vehicles to campus.
12	So in 22D, you have the prohibition. And then
13	you relax it is 23B.
14	We carried it forward. And I want
15	to know why you didn't carry it forward.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So what you
17	are saying is she's not saying it is
18	inhibit, it is restrict.
19	MR. CREWS: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It is the
21	equivalent of prohibit.
22	MR. CREWS: Right.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So is that
2	something that you could that the ZA could
3	enforce?
4	MR. CREWS: Well, I mean and,
5	again, I don't know that it is either, you
6	know, how could I enforce their ability to
7	prohibit other than I've mentioned the
8	appropriate that the West End Citizens
9	Association's proposal for appropriately
LO	sanction any discovered violators and keep a
11	full accounting of all violations and
L2	sanctions.
L3	But with it articulated what
L4	appropriate is
L5	MS. KAHLOW: I guess
L6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I do
L7	want to emphasize again
L8	MR. CREWS: Yes.
L9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: that what
20	the ZA would be enforcing is starting up top.
21	It says the transportation management plan
22	shall include the following: A, B, measures to

You would enforce that there are 1 restrict. measures to restrict in the transportation 2 management plan, not the restriction itself. 3 MR. CREWS: Right. 4 So you would see the 5 MS. KAHLOW: 6 letter to the parents and perspective students. You would see the website policies, 7 things like that. You would see the written 8 documents that are behind the restrictions. 9 MR. CREWS: Right. 10 That is why we wanted MS. KAHLOW: 11 specified those 12 to be sure that you 13 requirements. Okay, so we've gone -- going to 14 15 the next one, I'm trying to do a merge of 16 these two. Old 19, new 6D, they are not exactly parallel but we are trying to do the 17 18 old one and the new one. And that 19 aggregate FAR. MR. CREWS: Old 19? 20 MS. KAHLOW: Yes. 21 Or old 16, excuse me, 22 MR. CREWS:

1	new 19. Yes.
2	MS. KAHLOW: If you look at 19C,
3	recomputation of the university's total FAR.
4	And then you look at the new 6D. I'm sorry to
5	make this move it around but I'm trying to
6	make this easier. Report university's total
7	FAR.
8	If you look at the WECA's proposal
9	for 6D, why did you reject the WECA's proposed
10	additional measures of
11	MR. CREWS: 6D?
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Turn on your
13	mike please.
14	MR. CREWS: Excuse me. Thanks.
15	For 6D?
16	MS. KAHLOW: Yes.
17	MR. CREWS: I did not reject. I
18	said the proposed changes to the section are
19	policy issues. All are enforceable.
20	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. So you are
21	saying it would be okay to have FAR for all
22	proposed I didn't understand that.

1	MR. CREWS: Oh, yes. We would be
2	able to determine
3	MS. KAHLOW: FAR for all proposed
4	development.
5	MR. CREWS: FAR for all
6	proposed development pending before the
7	Commission.
8	MS. KAHLOW: And aggregate FAR for
9	the campus as a whole?
10	MR. CREWS: Right.
11	MS. KAHLOW: Why did you
12	characterize this as a policy issue? I'm not
13	clear on that.
14	MR. CREWS: Again because that is
15	up for the Commission, in my opinion, to
16	decide what the conditions of the campus plan
17	are. I'm just to decide whether or not, as
18	they are written, whether or not I think I
19	could adequately enforce them.
20	MS. KAHLOW: Do you know what GW's
21	current aggregate total FAR is now?
22	MR. CREWS: I do not.

MS. KAHLOW: So you don't know what it will be with the proposed campus plan?

MR. CREWS: Well, I mean it can be determined. Again, I'm not aware that previous Zoning Administrators have gathered and maintained that information.

And I think the Commission and all

And I think the Commission and all of the parties to this hearing should understand that if I am going to be able to enforce any of these conditions, I'm going to have to have the resources to do the work that will be involved.

I mean I probably should have started that out as a caveat. But I mean I am acutely aware of our struggle to provide the services that the residents of the District deserve.

MS. KAHLOW: Would you support the establishment of a campus-wide aggregate total FAR for all land in the campus even if upzoned? Then you actually could add it all up.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. CREWS: Well, I mean I don't
2	know that would I support a again, that
3	sounds like a policy decision. I think if
4	that was the decision, I think we would be
5	able, again with the resources, we would be
6	able to track that.
7	MS. KAHLOW: All right. Now let's
8	move on to another area. Moving back again,
9	not being able to catch everything, on 6C,
10	Compliance 6E, Compliance Report, the WECA
11	had suggested and you had rejected an addition
12	that said this was what they send in on
13	their regular compliance report, the number of
14	freshmen and sophomores sanctioned for
15	violating the parking restrictions.
16	And
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Which letter
18	are you on again? I'm sorry.
19	MS. KAHLOW: I'm sorry I didn't
20	mention it earlier but going back and forth is
21	a little harder.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

22

Which letter

1 are you on? 2 MS. KAHLOW: 6E of the new stuff. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: E what -- 6E? 3 6E of the new stuff 4 MS. KAHLOW: which is the headcount stuff. I'm not asking 5 6 about it. It is the end, our proposal at the 7 very end was after all this headcount and the number of freshmen 8 business, for violating sophomores sanctioned the 9 10 parking restrictions. Only freshmen and sophomores as set forth in condition 22. 11 MR. Again, I would 12 CREWS: 13 apologize only with the sense that that particular -- that would be obviously, 14 15 mentioned in condition 22, when we discussed 16 that, that that would be enforceable. That they could -- we could determine whether they 17 had provided the number. 18 19 MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I should have mentioned that earlier. Thank you. 20 Now let's go to new -- I'm going 21

to move to new -- at this point I'll go back

1	to old because there is no more crosswalk.
2	And you want to do new. So new 6G which is
3	the number of off-street parking spaces.
4	We had put a provision, the West
5	End had put a provision at the end that said
6	as well as descriptions of ancillary
7	commercial services such as car washing,
8	dispatch services of for-hire transportation.
9	Why did you reject that since
10	currently there is signage in GW's parking
11	facilities for these services?
12	MR. CREWS: Well, let me
13	MS. KAHLOW: And if, in fact, they
14	are you said they were not legal. If they
15	aren't legal, will you take an enforcement
16	action to stop the ancillary services?
17	MR. CREWS: If you could email me
18	on that, we will take a look at it.
19	MS. KAHLOW: It's what you have
20	
21	MR. CREWS: I mean in terms now of
22	your complaint, ma'am, we do operate on a

1	complaint basis in terms of enforcement.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
3	MR. CREWS: If you have got, you
4	know, a specific enforcement
5	MS. KAHLOW: We do.
6	MR. CREWS: we will do an
7	investigation.
8	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. All right.
9	MR. CREWS: But
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That
11	is not the purpose of this exercise so what is
12	the specific question?
13	MS. KAHLOW: The question is why
14	he rejected it since it is currently in use.
15	And it isn't apparently it isn't kosher so
16	we need to ask him to enforce it. And that is
17	why he rejected it. Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How much more
19	do you have because one of the things that is
20	hanging us up is you are characterizing what
21	Mr. Crews has written as rejecting. And often
22	he hasn't. He has said it is perfectly

1	enforceable. So I don't want to have to keep
2	rolling through those.
3	MS. KAHLOW: Well, Chairman, I
4	think when he says it is a policy question, it
5	was unclear if that meant it was enforceable
6	or not. Sometimes he says it, sometimes he
7	doesn't. And that is why I'm asking when it
8	doesn't say it there.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I haven't
10	we haven't stumbled across any of those yet.
11	MS. KAHLOW: All right.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So how much
13	more do you have?
14	MS. KAHLOW: I have quite a
15	number.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We need to
17	get this a little bit tighter. So
18	MS. KAHLOW: I'm trying to do what
19	she has to do is going between the two. And
20	I'm trying to do that. And that is a little
21	harder. I had these questions prepared
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I'm

1	going to help move this along. So ask your
2	question and
3	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: then I'm
5	going to
6	MS. KAHLOW: Number eight, new
7	number eight. The WECA suggested SP zone
8	properties also and you said that would be
9	enforceable. So that is a case, since he says
10	it is enforceable, it is not rejected. I got
11	it.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That is the kind of thing we just don't even want
13	is the kind of thing we just don't even want
13 14	is the kind of thing we just don't even want to talk about.
13 14 15	is the kind of thing we just don't even want to talk about. MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I've got it.
13 14 15	is the kind of thing we just don't even want to talk about. MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I've got it. I got what you just said. Thank you.
13 14 15 16	is the kind of thing we just don't even want to talk about. MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I've got it. I got what you just said. Thank you. Okay, Advisory Committee, number
113 114 115 116 117	is the kind of thing we just don't even want to talk about. MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I've got it. I got what you just said. Thank you. Okay, Advisory Committee, number 9B. Why did you reject the WECA's proposal to
113 114 115 116 117 118	is the kind of thing we just don't even want to talk about. MS. KAHLOW: Okay. I've got it. I got what you just said. Thank you. Okay, Advisory Committee, number 9B. Why did you reject the WECA's proposal to continue representation by the WECA?

effect enforcement of this condition. 1 2 Next. He did not reject that. Crews, if Ι misrepresent Mr. 3 anything that you wrote, you please just jump 4 in. 5 What is your next question? 6 All right. 7 MS. KAHLOW: So you are saying if he says the word policy, before 8 I ask him, let me make sure he doesn't say 9 10 policy in 10A. And you are probably not going to want this question. Ι just want 11 included we continuous 12 understand why enrollment of students and students at Mount 13 Vernon. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That is а policy issue for the Zoning Commission. 16 MS. KAHLOW: It doesn't say policy 17 in the bottom. So I didn't know that. So --18 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's actually not -- it is not a difficult concept whether 20 Mr. Crews called it that or not. There are 21 certain things that are up to the 22

Commission to decide. His role is to enforce 1 2 these restrictions that we put in place. it is all about enforceability with Mr. Crews. 3 4 MS. KAHLOW: Okay. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: As much as we 5 might like to elevate him to being a member of 6 7 the Commission, he's not there yet. Number 10C, for the MS. KAHLOW: 8 independent audit. The West End suggested 9 10 that we also have the Inspector General -- DC Inspector General. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 12 It says that 13 version of this commitment is your enforceable as written -- as you wrote it, it 14 15 would be enforceable. 16 MS. KAHLOW: I see so even it is not reflected here, okay. All right. 17 Α little translation here. 18 19 22C, new 22C, notice on temporary street closings, we had -- the West End had 20 said that temporary street closings would only 21 be as allowed under the DCMR. And you don't, 22

1	I don't believe, mention that at all. So I'm
2	not clear why.
3	MR. CREWS: I think it is a given.
4	You know that is public space. And, you
5	know, if they are going to close public space,
6	they are going to have to get a public space
7	permit to do that. But either way, it is
8	enforceable.
9	MS. KAHLOW: So every time we
10	could ask if there is a street closed to see a
11	public space permit?
12	MR. CREWS: I would hope so, yes.
13	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you.
14	Noise, how many noise complaints
15	are currently pending before DCRA and are
16	still under investigation?
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That is not
18	relevant to this proceeding.
19	MS. KAHLOW: It is condition
20	number 18.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It is not
22	relevant to this proceeding. The number of

1	noise complaints that are pending is not
2	relevant.
3	MR. CREWS: I might add that we
4	indicated that your change adds clarity on
5	number 18.
6	MS. KAHLOW: Yes. And I was just
7	wondering okay. The WECA suggested adding
8	conditions about compliance with the various
9	key crosscutting requirements such as the
LO	Americans With Disabilities Act.
11	MR. CREWS: Do you have a number
12	here?
13	MS. KAHLOW: I'm looking for it.
L4	MR. CREWS: Okay.
15	MS. KAHLOW: If you will give me
L6	just a moment. It is our numbers 26 and 27.
L7	Oh, I see. And you said do not create an
L8	enforcement problem so you are okay with those
L9	two. I understand that. I understand that,
20	thank you. All right. So now I've got those.
21	I don't have a question since Chairman
22	explained how she wanted to handle it.

1	Now I have a series of questions
2	about the current situation and if you could
3	just give me a I'll make them very fast.
4	Disciplinary interventions, hotline, do you
5	have any have you analyzed any of that?
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Not relevant.
7	MS. KAHLOW: Not relevant even
8	though it is currently they are current
9	conditions?
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you want
11	to inquire of Mr. Crews as to his enforcement
12	on anything under the existing campus plan,
13	I'm sure he would be more than willing to sit
14	down and talk to you about that. But that is
15	not the purpose of this forum.
16	MS. KAHLOW: The problem is that
17	some of those conditions were not carried
18	forward. But they're not relevant, okay, even
19	if they are not carried forward. All right.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The existing
21	campus plan is in force right now.

 ${\tt MS.}$ KAHLOW: I'm saying but they

1	aren't carried into the new conditions.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understood
3	what you said.
4	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But you seem
6	to be wanting to enquire about the current
7	state of affairs.
8	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. Okay. And the
9	same would be with off-campus living. I guess
10	we're not allowed to ask about that either.
11	Okay. Number 17, off-campus living, current
12	17.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If it is
14	anything about the current state of affairs,
15	it is not relevant to this proceeding.
16	MS. KAHLOW: Bear with me must a
17	moment please. I have to find the new version
18	of it if you will bear with me just a moment.
19	It is the new 19, old 17, new 19.
20	And since you say it is enforceable, I can't
21	ask about it. Okay. I understand. I had to
22	find it first because I didn't have the

crosswalk.

I think that is it. Just give me a second to check through my questions here. I think that is it for Mr. Crews. Thank you for your indulgence.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

MR. CREWS: My pleasure.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Crews. You are free to go.

Okay. Next we were -- we had asked to have -- no offense, Mr. Jennings, somebody different than you come. So perhaps you would like to come forward and tell us why you are alone.

MR. JENNINGS: Good evening, Madam Chair. I'm along tonight because Mr. Bah, who was originally mentioned back on October 11 as someone who should be here, he is traveling overseas as he does each year for family purposes. My supervisor, Ken Laden, had an emergency in his family and could not make it tonight either.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well
2	unless someone I frankly don't know quite
3	what to do with the situation. But unless
4	someone feels differently, I think we can let
5	Mr. Jennings go because I don't think there is
6	anything fruitful going to come from he was
7	here when we were asking cross examination
8	before.
9	MR. JENNINGS: I'd be happy to try
10	and answer any question that the opposition
11	may have here tonight. A lot of the comments
12	that have been provided to the Zoning
13	Commission I provided via Ken Laden's
14	signature.
15	So, again, all the information
16	that has been provided
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. What
18	is your pleasure, Mr. Hitchcock?
19	MR. HITCHCOCK: Madam Chair, I'm
20	happy to push forward with questions.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Go
22	ahead.

1	MR. HITCHCOCK: And I would state
2	for the Commission's benefit, I will be
3	referring to the DDOT report that Mr. Jennings
4	just cited which is dated November 27, 2006.
5	I have some questions on those.
6	And also Mr. Mera provided a
7	supplemental statement that has the same date.
8	I would note in the interest of trying to
9	speed the process along that we did have
10	occasion to, on behalf of Foggy Bottom
11	Association and ANC, to talk with some staff.
12	But it was not prior to the preparation of
13	the report.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
15	CROSS EXAMINATION
16	MR. HITCHCOCK: Mr. Jennings, I
17	have a few questions for you. Let's start
18	with the first page dealing with the truck
19	traffic. Do you have that?
20	MR. JENNINGS: I do.
21	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. The third
22	paragraph talks about heavy truck vehicle

1	usage and as I read that, I mean you are
2	really making two points there aren't you?
3	About levels of service and also about GW's
4	ability to handle its own truck traffic?
5	MR. JENNINGS: We did our best to
6	try and respond to Mr. Mera's comments, the
7	comments, I think, that he provided back on
8	and correct me if I'm wrong was it
9	September 28?
10	MR. HITCHCOCK: If you say so.
11	MR. JENNINGS: Okay.
12	MR. HITCHCOCK: I don't remember
13	the date.
14	MR. JENNINGS: A cover letter, I
15	think signed by you, accompanied Joe Mera's
16	comments with respect to some of the comments
17	that he wanted to put into the record.
18	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay.
19	MR. JENNINGS: So we did try to
20	address as many of those concerns as possible,
21	number one being truck traffic. We agreed
22	with what the applicant had to provide to us.

I've been doing my best to try and sit down with as many traffic engineers within DDOT to try and come to some understanding as to how severe the truck traffic, as Mr. Mera points out, will be in the vicinity of the campus plan.

And we feel as though that with a staff person, as the applicant has suggested, a staff person being that transportation coordinator, we will be able to help provide significant amounts of assistance in coordinating the trash truck deliveries and service deliveries.

In addition to that, we are aware of what the levels of service will do with additional truck traffic.

MR. HITCHCOCK: But my point is those are two distinct issues. The question is -- what GW will do with its own traffic deliveries is different from the question of how many trucks are on the street. So let me suggest that we look at them separately.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	The truck traffic figures that Mr.
2	Mera cited indicated that the correct figure
3	was not two percent but as high as 16 to 48
4	percent. Correct?
5	MR. JENNINGS: For one particular
6	site.
7	MR. HITCHCOCK: All right.
8	MR. JENNINGS: Correct me if I'm
9	wrong.
10	MR. HITCHCOCK: But the 48 was a
11	high, right?
12	MR. JENNINGS: For which
13	particular portion of the campus plan?
14	MR. HITCHCOCK: Well, this was
15	I would direct you do you have a copy of
16	Mr. Mera's statement there? I'm happy to
17	provide you with one.
18	I would direct your attention to -
19	-
20	MR. JENNINGS: However in its
21	Square 54 traffic study revision
22	MR HITCHCOCK: Right

1	MR. JENNINGS: Wells used
2	observed truck percentages
3	MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes.
4	MR. JENNINGS: 48 percent. So
5	we're talking more Square 54 than we are the
6	campus plan, is that correct?
7	MR. HITCHCOCK: Well, we are
8	talking about reality. We're talking about
9	the number of trucks on the street.
LO	MR. JENNINGS: As am I.
11	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. And would
L2	not a 40 percent truck usage rate suggest that
L3	using a two percent rate was not appropriate?
L4	MR. JENNINGS: I think when you
L5	look at the overall campus plan, the applicant
L6	has done its best to try and understand what
L7	impact the truck traffic will do to the entire
18	area. When you talk about particular sections
L9	within the campus plan, then that is when we -
20	_
21	MR. HITCHCOCK: Well, but let's
22	talk about the independent analysis that DDOT

did with respect to two percent versus 1 2 If 48 percent of the truck traffic trucks to 48 percent, that 3 is up Can you explain the independent 4 different. analysis DDOT did? 5 MR. JENNINGS: Sure. We feel as 6 7 though that the traffic engineers within DDOT, whoever viewed this case quite a few times as 8 a matter of fact since we last came here on 9 10 October 11 to discuss the entire campus plan, that the truck traffic, it has been an issue. 11 We discussed it great length. 12 13 we felt as though that the applicant provided us enough substantial detail to let us approve 14 15 their transportation impact study. 16 MR. HITCHCOCK: Well --MITTEN: CHAIRPERSON Т think 17 there's a more specific question here. And 18 19 let me just see if I'm understanding it. maybe we can get some additional information 20

There is a study that shows that

NEAL R. GROSS

21

22

from DDOT if not.

1	at certain locations, trucks are 16 percent of
2	the total traffic volume?
3	MR. HITCHCOCK: Street traffic,
4	right. The default assumption is two percent
5	in the original Wells study.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I got that
7	part.
8	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So we
10	have some locations showing 16. We have other
11	locations showing 48.
12	MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Jennings,
14	you are saying in the aggregate across the
15	campus, DDOT believes that the aggregated
16	amount is two percent?
17	MR. JENNINGS: Using the two
18	percent is common.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But what Mr.
20	Hitchcock's concern is is that saying that is
21	common in the face of actual data to the
22	contrary is troubling. So how is it that in

1	the face of data that is to the contrary, how
2	does DDOT conclude that two percent is
3	appropriate in this context? Is that a fair -
4	_
5	MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes, that is an
6	accurate characterization.
7	MR. JENNINGS: Sure, sure. Allow
8	me to I'm not going to try and speak
9	traffic engineer speak tonight in any way
10	whatsoever. So allow me to try and do some
11	more investigation with the traffic engineers
12	at DDOT.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So we
14	have a very specific question
15	MR. JENNINGS: Absolutely.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: which is
17	in the face of data showing truck volume
18	between 16 percent and 48 percent, how do they
19	reconcile those observations with the use of a
20	two percent default rate? Very specific
21	question.

NEAL R. GROSS

Okay.

MR. JENNINGS:

1 MR. HITCHCOCK: Madam Chair, Ι 2 came up here hoping to be able to try to cut through a number and perhaps finish. 3 I'm not 4 sure whether -- I mean we can continue to proceed in this fashion but we may end up with 5 the same situation. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I was going to suggest before you guys wanted to try 8 and take a shot at it, which I appreciate you 9 10 willing to do, is that there be a series of questions, specific questions, as specific as 11 you can, submitted to DDOT and submitted to 12 13 the record. And then we leave the record open for a certain period of time. 14 And then all the great minds 15 DDOT can assemble the answers and get them 16 back to the Commission --17 MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: because 20 I'm, you know, these are very important issues for the Commission and for the community.

NEAL R. GROSS

And, you know, frankly I understand that there

21

1	are emergencies but, you know, DDOT needs to
2	understand when there is a case of such import
3	that Mr. Bah could have been here the first
4	time or Mr. Laden could have been here the
5	first time.
6	So because, you know, this is -
7	- we've been together many times. So is that
8	an acceptable way?
9	MR. HITCHCOCK: The problem with
10	that is that I can't ask a follow-up question.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I know.
12	MR. HITCHCOCK: And a lot of this
13	depends on follow up. I mean if you assume
14	two percent, they say, you know, we've looked
15	at and we think two percent is correct. And
16	if that is the answer, I can't get beyond
17	that.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Mr.
19	Hitchcock
20	MR. HITCHCOCK: I mean I've got a
21	number of questions.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- let me --

1	MR. HITCHCOCK: Sure.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: let me ask
3	you to give us a little credit that if they
4	give a lame answer not to say that that was
5	one but just if they did, that we would go you
6	know what, we don't have enough information
7	yet.
8	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then
10	but, you know, I'd like to try and close this
11	out. And then if they give incomplete
12	answers, then it is up to us
13	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: to say
15	look, I really feel strongly about that piece
16	of information. And we'll figure out a way to
17	get it.
18	MR. HITCHCOCK: Let me state for
19	the record I give the Commission loads of
20	credit.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
22	MR. HITCHCOCK: But I will submit

1	a set of questions.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Is
3	that acceptable to you, Ms. Dwyer? Okay.
4	MR. HITCHCOCK: All right.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
6	MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Kahlow,
8	are you willing to if you have any follow
9	up I'm sorry
10	MS. KAHLOW: Simple, on the report
11	
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
13	MS. KAHLOW: and also for the
14	record.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You mean also
16	a set of follow-up questions?
17	MS. KAHLOW: Yes. I have a chart
18	that I would like for him instead of going
19	line by line, that he could actually respond
20	to. I prepared a chart on analyzing a one-
21	page chart analyzing this. And if he could
22	then go through it then I don't know that

1	he will be able to each street, I think
2	DDOT would be better able to answer it.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm not sure
4	Mr. Jennings is going to be
5	MS. KAHLOW: That is what I'm
6	saying.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
8	MS. KAHLOW: We could do that for
9	the record.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. All
11	right.
12	MS. KAHLOW: But I'm saying the
13	simple stuff, I'll try first.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
15	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you, Mr.
16	Jennings, for coming back.
17	(Laughter.)
18	MS. KAHLOW: It is a tough crowd
19	here. Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He drew the
21	short straw tonight.
22	MS. KAHLOW: You drew the short

straw.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm looking back at the old questions and answered in this some were 27th November and some were not. And Ι wondered if you were able to come up with those answers or could provide it for the record.

rirst was what was the total number of non-peak hour zone 2 spaces in the campus plan area? And what are the total number of metered spaces in the campus plan area? So we could get a basis for the 23 or more spaces that are being removed.

MR. JENNINGS: Combined 635 spaces in the campus area, approximately 70 percent, I believe the number if I'm correct is about 440 -- I may be a little off, I don't have the number off the top of my head. Out of the 635, approximately 440 spaces are metered spaces. And the duration or the rest come in as RPP zone 2.

MS. KAHLOW: So less than 200?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. JENNINGS: I believe so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay. MS. KAHLOW: Moving along, if you look at your page two, paragraph one, three, four, five, you talk We had asked you the number of citations. complaints that DDOT had received about student parking in the campus plan area. how DDOT responded to those complaints as well as what you provided here. Do you know that?

MR. JENNINGS: I have a little bit of knowledge that I can share tonight. doing some investigation and research, asking the Department of Public Works Parking Enforcement to come forward with how complaints they receive, they don't necessarily -- they didn't respond to us with the amount of service request calls that they had received from GW -- the vicinity of GW.

What they were able to respond with is in our November 27 comments and, for the record, there are 10,400 some odd --

MS. KAHLOW: Sixty-five.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. JENNINGS: Thank you, 10,465
2	parking citations were issued in a one-year
3	period. In trying to answer what you posed to
4	us back on October 11 in as much of a complete
5	fashion as possible, I visited the campus on
6	November 9, had a Parking Enforcement official
7	with me, and he told me during his eight-hour
8	shift the common is to issue 60 citations.
9	And I said how many of those,
10	during your eight-hour shift, are generated by
11	service request calls or calls that come in
12	via the Mayor's Service Request Center, 727-
13	1000? He said often times less than ten.
14	MS. KAHLOW: Less than ten
15	percent? Or less than ten number?
16	MR. JENNINGS: Out of the 60
17	MS. KAHLOW: So one-sixth? Less
18	than one-sixth. Okay. Well at least we got
19	that.
20	Now if we can go to that's the
21	old stuff. Now for going to this report,
22	again that page, your number you just quoted,

1	the 10,465 tickets in a one-year period, is
2	that a lot in comparison to other campuses
3	like American, Georgetown?
4	MR. JENNINGS: As the Ward 3
5	transportation planner who has detailed out to
6	these portions of Ward 2 at the current time,
7	that is a substantial amount of citations in a
8	12-year period.
9	I can honestly say that American
10	University does not receive that kind of
11	attention from DPW Parking Enforcement.
12	MS. KAHLOW: And do you have any
13	idea about Georgetown?
14	MR. JENNINGS: I apologize. I
15	don't.
16	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. Now two
17	paragraphs beyond that, the last paragraph, do
18	you have that document with you? The last
19	paragraph on page two?
20	MR. JENNINGS: Which document are
21	you looking at?
22	MS. KAHLOW: The one the

November 27th the bike lane stuff.
Remember we went through the bike lane stuff
last time and you said there would be 100
spaces created. How many of those are
because you talked about K and L and that is
nowhere near the campus plan, how many of the
100 would be in the campus plan area?
MR. JENNINGS: I think Jim
Sebastian mentioned that it would be
approximately three-quarters of that number,
somewhere in the ballpark of 75 would be
within the campus area.
MS. KAHLOW: You don't have any
more detail where that might be?
MR. JENNINGS: No. But if you are
talking south of Pennsylvania Avenue, I think
that is where Jim was trying to go with that.
MS. KAHLOW: Okay. All right. I
think the other one for the record and I can
hand this to you so you since it would be
too complicated I think for today. And I will

give one to everybody else.

1 I'm statistician so Ι hundreds of pages 2 through these and together a table. Mr. Jennings? 3 And what I'm asking is that if you 4 look at the bottom, 11 to 16 increase in grade 5 6 despite mitigation, three are no change in their failing grade and two are -- I don't 7 quite understand how it can go from failing to 8 unfailing. 9 10 But there are 16 of 67 intersections and I want to know DDOT's take 11 on if these are already failing intersections 12 13 under the various conditions as the Foggy Bottom Association suggests to be modified, 14 15 what would happen? And would there be any 16 additions to the 16 of the 67 intersections that already failed? 17 And I don't expect you to answer 18 19 this today. But if you could look at this --That's really --20 MR. JENNINGS: MS. KAHLOW: -- and see if there 21

are any additions, that was all I wanted to

1	do. And I thought this would be helpful for
2	all of us because it is so much reading.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
4	MS. KAHLOW: That's all I have.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Great.
7	Thank you.
8	MS. KAHLOW: Do you want me to put
9	that in writing? Or I think he knows with the
10	chart what to do with it, right?
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Why don't you
12	just do a little short memo so that
13	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: it is
15	understood explicitly.
16	MS. KAHLOW: And to whom would I
17	send that? To Mr. Laden?
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Jennings,
19	I guess.
20	MS. KAHLOW: To Mr. Jennings?
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
22	MS. KAHLOW: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And copy the
2	Commission.
3	MS. KAHLOW: Very good. Thank
4	you.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
6	Okay, Mr. Jennings, I just need a
7	little bit of help from you, which is if you
8	got questions within a week, how long would
9	DDOT need to respond?
10	MR. JENNINGS: I think if you can
11	give us until the close of business on
12	Tuesday? If you are talking these questions
13	here tonight or if you are talking in the
14	future?
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, well Mr.
16	Hitchcock has to provide you a list of
17	questions. So I was thinking about giving him
18	a week to pull those together.
19	MR. JENNINGS: Sure.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He might not
21	need that long but so how long would it take
22	you given that you don't know what the

1	questions are yet?
2	MR. JENNINGS: If you can give us
3	three business days, I'm pretty confident we
4	can get back to you.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Three
6	business days?
7	MR. JENNINGS: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We
9	will leave the record open longer than that.
10	Okay. I just want to make sure we have the
11	record open an adequate amount of time for
12	you. Okay. And Ms. Schellin will pass the
13	word about when the record is finally closed.
14	Thank you.
15	Okay. So now there are it is
16	time for questions on the additional
17	submission.
18	First let me ask if any of my
19	colleagues had any questions for the applicant
20	on the additional submission that we got.
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No? Okay.

1	Mr. Hitchcock, did you have
2	questions?
3	MR. HITCHCOCK: Again, in the
4	interest of moving things along, we had
5	comments on the substantial compliance issue
6	but we will save those for the findings of
7	fact and conclusions of law.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine.
9	MR. HITCHCOCK: We are still in
10	disagreement with them but I think we can
11	handle that on paper rather than with oral
12	questions.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	MR. HITCHCOCK: The one question
16	that I did have relates to Exhibit C. This is
17	the proposed condition regarding faculty and
18	staff which has the convenient aspect of being
19	only one page.
20	Mr. Katz, I would draw your
21	attention to the new paragraph C where you
22	propose Mr. Barber, welcome

MR. BARBER: Thank you.

HITCHCOCK: defining MR. outsourcing activity in a way that only covers termination within 30 days of 50 or staff assigned faculty or to specific а department or unit. How did you come up with that?

Well, let me start -- how did you come up with the number 50?

MR. KATZ: The reason we used this definition -- because for compliance purposes, a mechanism in place to do have already because this is the federal regulations relative to the WARN Act and literally how you have to note -- what kind of notification you have to do if you outsource 50 or more employees.

And what we were trying to do is come up with a mechanism that really -- that we can comply with and it, in fact, would end up being enforceable. So again we used the definition in the WARN Act which is federal

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	regulation. And then what we've done is we've
2	tied it to the further proceedings with the
3	Zoning Commission so that there is an
4	enforcement vehicle behind it.
5	So there is a transparency and we
6	believe that we can do what we are suggesting
7	because by federal law, we have to do this
8	already.
9	MR. HITCHCOCK: And could you
10	state for the record what is the WARN Act and
11	what does it try to regulate?
12	MR. KATZ: I will let Charles
13	Barber do that.
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	MR. BARBER: The WARN Act, the
16	Workforce Adjustment Renotification Act.
17	MR. HITCHCOCK: Oh, WARN, W-A-R-N.
18	MR. BARBER: WARN.
19	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay.
20	MR. BARBER: Are you familiar with
21	that?
22	MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes. Okay. I

1	just wanted but go ahead. Just you were
2	going to describe it. Right. Right.
3	MR. BARBER: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He wants to
5	make sure that we get it.
6	MR. BARBER: I see. This is a
7	federal law
8	MR. HITCHCOCK: I want to make
9	sure the record gets it.
10	MR. BARBER: that addressed
11	mass layoffs of employees. And Congress
12	wanted to provide certain protections for mass
13	layoffs so they defined mass layoffs. And it
14	specifies what kind of notice the employer has
15	to give the employees in those situations,
16	what kind of opportunities post employment,
17	those kinds of issues that deal with mass
18	layoffs.
19	MR. HITCHCOCK: Sure. But you
20	would agree with me, would you not, that it
21	doesn't deal with land use issues?
22	MR. BARBER: No, it is not a land

use act. It is an employment act but we
thought it was an appropriate measure since we
already have to comply with that, you know,
mass layoff kind of context, yes.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. But it is,
therefore, possible under this definition that
you could do considerable outsourcing with
smaller departments, smaller numbers of
personnel and achieve the same results
although over, perhaps, a longer period?
MR. BARBER: We were looking for a
balance for something that we could achieve,
something that was workable, and also
addressed the concerns that we thought were
present. And we thought tying it to an
existing federal regulation was the way to go.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. How many of
these reports have you filed this year?
MR. BARBER: None to my knowledge
this year.
MR. HITCHCOCK: How about last
year?

1	MR. BARBER: I don't recall.
2	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. Any in the
3	years gone by?
4	MR. BARBER: I don't know.
5	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. So in other
6	words, this might not be terribly effective as
7	a reporting mechanism then?
8	MR. BARBER: We would comply if we
9	at such time we have the kind of situation.
LO	I just don't know how frequently we have that
11	type of situation.
L2	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay.
L3	MR. BARBER: But we certainly
L4	would comply with federal law once we do.
L5	MR. HITCHCOCK: But if GW is not
L6	filing this information now, it is not really
L7	a a means of facilitating compliance.
L8	MR. BARBER: No, I don't agree
L9	with that.
20	MR. HITCHCOCK: All right.
21	MR. BARBER: And I no longer beat
22	my wife either.

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Come
3	on.
4	MR. HITCHCOCK: I think I made the
5	point.
6	MR. BARBER: Okay.
7	MR. HITCHCOCK: I have no further
8	questions. Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank
10	you.
11	Ms. Kahlow?
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	MS. KAHLOW: I only have questions
14	on the same Exhibit C. Are you familiar with
15	OMB circular A-76 that covers all federal and
16	federally-regulated such as grantees
17	compliance with outsourcing?
18	MR. BARBER: No.
19	MS. KAHLOW: Would you be willing,
20	since the number is ten for certain things, 20
21	for others, would you be willing to change the
22	threshold to the federal standard that

1	actually applies to your university?
2	MR. BARBER: I'm not sure I accept
3	the premise of the question. But I thought no
4	we are not willing to change to that number.
5	MS. KAHLOW: So you would reject
6	analyzing all outsourcing of ten or more
7	employees in a function?
8	MR. BARBER: Yes.
9	MR. KATZ: Yes, we would reject
10	that.
11	MS. KAHLOW: Okay. Is there a
12	possibility to submit for the record the
13	federal standard that applies to GW?
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, we're
15	not the arbiter of what applies.
16	MS. KAHLOW: I understand. But
17	could we submit it?
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So if the
19	university is representing to us that they
20	believe that they are bound by a reporting
21	requirement for 50 or more
22	MS. KAHLOW: That is for layoffs.

1	But I'm saying of outsourcing. This is the
2	federal standard that applies to all grantees.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood,
4	jump in please.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Assuredly.
6	Ms. Kahlow mentioned A-76 and Mr. Barber you
7	mentioned that you were not familiar with
8	that. Is that
9	MR. BARBER: No, I'm not.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
11	Well maybe, I think Ms. Kahlow's point is very
12	valid with outsourcing. I'm not sure, maybe
13	we need to look into that. And at least maybe
14	we can ask GW
15	MR. BARBER: If you look at the
16	record
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let me
18	do this. If you want to submit that then the
19	applicant can respond and tell us the
20	applicability.
21	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you. I'd be
22	happy to do so.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
2	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you. That's
3	all I have.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks.
5	Boy, I'm going to get an education
6	in outsourcing here.
7	Okay, no more okay. I think
8	we're very close.
9	CLOSING STATEMENT
10	MS. DWYER: Good evening. Our
11	closing statement this evening will be in two
12	parts. I will address the legal requirements
13	of the PUD and campus plan applications. And
14	Lou Katz will address the important of this
15	case to the university, the community, and the
16	city. But together we will take about seven
17	minutes. So we will be quick.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
19	MS. DWYER: And I wanted to start
20	by thanking each of you as well as the
21	participants who are in the audience as those

who aren't here tonight but attended all the

hearings for the time and attention you have given this case.

It has been a long process to get to this point and we appreciate very much your willingness to compress these hearings so that the case could be understood comprehensively and the groundwork laid for the School Without Walls and the Square 54 PUDs.

We believe that through the course of these hearings we have addressed all of the legal requirements that would entitle us to the requested special exception as well as the PUD and Map Amendment approval.

And let me just summarize. First, we come here with the full support of the Office of Planning, the Department of Transportation, and the Historic Preservation Office. Each agency has thoroughly evaluated the applications and given its recommendation of approval.

We also have the support of 108 individuals, 41 who testified in support, 12

NEAL R. GROSS

who submitted their testimony for the record, and 55 who wrote individual letters of support as well as the support of the Mayor's Office of Community Affairs.

addressed Second, have the we legal requirements for the special exception. Based on all of the testimony and evidence of record, this campus plan will have objectionable impact of in terms noise, traffic, number of students, or other objectionable impacts. In fact, as the Office of Planning has stated, it will improve the existing conditions.

Third, we have addressed why the PUD and rezonings are needed. The PUD provides certainty, predictability, and in addition important public control, to amenities, preservation benefits and historic resources, enhanced streetscape plan, neighborhood-serving retail, and commitments the university regarding off bу properties.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The rezonings provide the additional height and density in the core of the campus to achieve these goals.

Finally, the 20-year time frame is appropriate for many reasons. The scope of the development plan may take that long and more to achieve. The development of Square 54 as a town center and the historic district are both long-term commitments. And importantly, the community and the city get the benefit of the 20-year commitment on the off-campus restrictions as well as reports each all of the year on conditions.

In summary, we believe that based on the testimony and evidence of record, the precedent of this Commission, the legal tests applied by the DC Court of Appeals, we meet the legal requirements.

MR. KATZ: Thank you.

On behalf of the university, I would like to personally thank you, thank the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Commissioners for the time, attention, and thoughtful consideration you have given to this case through all six hearings as well as the School Without Walls and the Square 54 projects which have also come before you over the past two months.

Importantly, all stakeholders have had an opportunity to participate in a deliberative process and it has been an experience from which I believe we all have learned. The constructive dialog has resulted in clarifications and refinements to our proposed plan and conditions.

We believe the result is a better plan much the same way the collaborative community-based planning process resulted in an improved plan for the future of the Foggy Bottom Campus than the one we, ourselves, had initially envisioned.

As we all know, at the opening of these hearings, Commissioner Hood asked why are we here. That is where we began and we

NEAL R. GROSS

think it is a good place to end. A number of factors brought us to this place.

Fundamentally, in order to become a world-class research institution, we need additional space for our programs and facilities to carry out our plan for academic excellence. We understand that we are a part of a broader community and we know that the town/gown tensions, while not unique to our university, do not benefit anybody.

This comprehensive planning effort reflects our strong desire to proactively address ongoing issues of community concern.

And finally, the unique opportunity for the redevelopment of Square 54, which like the public/private School Without Walls partnership, benefits not only the university but the community and the District alike.

Much in the way the 2000 plan addressed the key issues of student housing, we think this plan will address the major

NEAL R. GROSS

issues that we face today, our need to improve our academic facilities in a way that respects our neighbors.

The collaborative community-based planning process that led to the proposed campus plan took a fresh look at the campus in the context of the surrounding neighborhoods and provided an opportunity to create a balanced plan that benefits all stakeholders.

providing additional density concentrated on the core of our campus, the plan accommodates our space needs within the existing campus plan boundaries, provides for a significant campus historic district, allows the university to make commitments about the future and acquisition of off-campus use properties, brings more students into our campus housing beginning with the Commission's recent approval of the School Without Walls project, and allows for the redevelopment of Square 54.

This process has also provided the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opportunity to reaffirm GW's commitment to the issues of compliance with the campus plan. We've demonstrated that the commitment and the new plan goes even further to clarify and define the conditions in an effort to avoid questions of compliance moving forward.

You heard from our students and how they describe the GW experience. It is one that is integrated with the city. We are truly a campus in and of the District of Columbia.

We understand and accept that we must properly account for the impacts of our campus but we need to continue to deliver education that responds to student needs and encourages students to experience all that GW and this city have to offer.

We will not let our students down, our current students as well as future generations of GW students. And to that end, we will continue to advance the institution in order to further our reputation as a world-

NEAL R. GROSS

class research university.

The nature of a university is to build community both inside and outside of the institution. And through these hearings, we believe that you have heard from our community. We firmly believe that this campus plan provides the best solution for the university, the community, and the District of Columbia. And that is why we are here.

Thank you again for your time, attention, and consideration.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you very much.

Okay. We have a little bit of paperwork yet to get in the record. So this is what I'm going to suggest is that one week from tonight, the questions for DDOT would be due into the record and also then to DDOT.

And then we would also, on the same timeline, Ms. Kahlow would make her submission regarding the outsourcing. And that date would be --

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. SCHELLIN: December 7th.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: December
3	7th. And then two weeks after December 7th,
4	then DDOT's responses would be due. And the
5	applicant's response to Ms. Kahlow's
6	submission regarding outsourcing would be due.
7	And that date would be
8	MS. SCHELLIN: December 21.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: December
10	21st.
11	MS. DWYER: And the applicant
12	would also be permitted to respond to the
13	questions that Mr. Hitchcock is filing. Our
14	traffic consultant could respond to the same
15	questions that DDOT is?
16	MR. HITCHCOCK: Excuse me. This
17	is a substitute for cross examination of DDOT.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
19	MR. HITCHCOCK: It's not an
20	opportunity to put a sixth piece of evidence
21	into the record. There are five studies.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Mr.

1	Hitchcock.
2	MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we
4	will just get the responses from DDOT without
5	further response from the applicant. And then
6	I guess on the 21st, proposed findings of fact
7	and conclusions of law would be due then.
8	Yes? Or later?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: We could give them
10	until December 29th.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Your
12	choice.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: I think the 21st is
14	fine for us.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, we have
16	parties, too. We'll see.
17	MS. KAHLOW: It is not fine for
18	me. Is there a way we are going to get the
19	transcripts first? When will we get those?
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, all but
21	tonight's should be available already.
22	MS. KAHLOW: I haven't seen any of

1	them. Can they be
2	MS. SCHELLIN: They are available
3	in our office.
4	MS. KAHLOW: Is there a way to
5	email them to me?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: You can contact our
7	office and there is someone who could do that.
8	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you.
9	So when will tonight's be
10	available?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: I believe it takes
12	11 days.
13	MS. DWYER: We'll do an expedited
14	transcript of tonight's hearing.
15	MS. KAHLOW: Thank you. So
16	December 29th is
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let's
18	do the 29th.
19	MS. KAHLOW: a lot more
20	reasonable.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I can promise
22	you, we're not reading any of the submissions

1	over Christmas. We are not going to. You
2	guys can busily work away. We will read them
3	after Christmas.
4	Okay, so then findings of fact and
5	conclusions of law due on December 29th. And
6	then depending on what our January agenda
7	looks like, we may put this on for a special
8	public meeting or it may be in January. We'll
9	just have to see.
10	I think, Mr. Hitchcock, you look
11	like you want to say something.
12	MR. HITCHCOCK: No.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, okay.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Can I just add that
15	all submissions should be filed by three
16	o'clock p.m. And the DDOT one, if possible,
17	if Ms. Kahlow and Mr. Hitchcock could serve
18	them directly along with the parties?
19	MR. HITCHCOCK: I'm sorry. Serve
20	
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Along with the
22	parties

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: DDOT, if you
2	would send the questions directly to DDOT.
3	MR. HITCHCOCK: Oh, yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: In addition
5	to filing
6	MR. HITCHCOCK: I'll send them by
7	email so they can also fill in the answers
8	right after the question. And you will be
9	able to the Commission can follow it more
10	easily.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That
12	sounds great.
13	Okay. Thanks to everybody for
14	sticking with us over the long haul. We look
15	forward to taking this matter up in January.
16	And I would just anybody who is
17	here for our next hearing, we'll just take a
18	five-minute break and then we will resume with
19	the MidAtlantic Realty hearing.
20	Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
22	public hearing was concluded at 6:43 p.m.)